

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION

CHARLTON WATSON §  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:14cv342  
LINDA RICHY, ET AL. §

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff Charlton Watson, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights. This Court ordered that the case be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

This lawsuit was severed out of a larger one. Watson was directed to file an amended complaint and to pay the filing fee or seek leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, but he did not comply. The magistrate judge issued a report recommending that the lawsuit be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute or to obey an order of the Court.

Watson received a copy of this report but filed no objections thereto; accordingly, he is barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this cause and the report of the magistrate judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the report of the magistrate judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918, 109 S.Ct. 3243

(1989) (where no objections to a magistrate judge's report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law"). It is accordingly

**ORDERED** that the report of the magistrate judge (docket no. 3) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

**ORDERED** that the above-styled civil action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to prosecute or to obey an order of the Court. Finally, it is

**ORDERED** that any and all motions which may be pending in this action are hereby **DENIED**.

**SIGNED** this 16th day of October, 2015.



MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE